



UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION



OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

HR/PARIS/SEM.3/2003/BP.9  
26 December 2002

ORIGINAL: English

OHCHR/UNESCO WORKSHOP TO DEVELOP PUBLICATION TO COMBAT  
RACISM AND TO FOSTER TOLERANCE

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION OF THE THIRD  
DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Paris, 19 to 20 February 2003  
Topic 9

RACISM, RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AND RELATED INTOLERANCE  
RELATING TO THE MEDIA, INCLUDING NEW INFORMATION  
TECHNOLOGIES

Background paper prepared by

Bent Sørensen,  
Head of Unit Information and Communication at the European Monitoring Centre on  
Racism and Xenophobia

---

Note: The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author.

(SHS-2003/WS/5)

## **Introduction**

We live in a society dominated by the media. They influence attitudes, prejudices and peoples capacity to act. The information and images brought into our homes each and every day go a long way towards shaping our understanding of the world and life surrounded by cultural ethnic and religious diversity.

We are all affected by the media. Be it as listeners, viewers or readers. And the media's ability to influence us is growing all the time as the speed of communication increases, the range of virtual media worlds is extended and the power of internet takes hold.

Our societies are called upon more and more to examine the influence of the media and to shape its effects in a positive and constructive way, especially in terms of how we deal with cultural, ethnic and religious diversity, particularly when confronting racism, xenophobia and right-wing extremism.

From the onset of the information age, the media have often defined attitudes towards ethnic, national, religious or social groups different from that identified as the particular media's target groups. Indeed, media often sought to become the spokespersons of a particular group, and to define its attitude toward all and any others. This helped spread nationalism, anti-Semitism, racism and xenophobia as it was seen during the Nazi regime. This type of media activity is by no means a thing of the past only, as recent events in the Balkans prove all too well.

However, today's media have become more consolidated and reach out to a larger audience, and many of the hitherto reviled or simply distrusted others have become valued customers, readers, listeners and viewers, and in this sense, the market has proved to be the most effective instrument of eliminating some forms of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, though new forms of discriminatory practices and racism have developed.

Regardless of circumstances some groups seem to remain more vulnerable than others to hostility, including that expressed in the media. These groups have been marginalized in society and therefore cannot expect much media attention as customers or civic solidarity as citizens. These include minorities, new immigrants, non-citizens, representatives of non-native races or religions, especially the uneducated and poor. In contemporary Europe a list of such groups would include the Muslims, the Roma, and in many European Union countries, immigrants and asylum seekers from outside the EU. Though anti-Semitism has been delegitimised since the Second World War in public discourse in democratic European States, and though Jews are, as a rule, no more a politically or socially marginalized or threatened group, they remain vulnerable to anti-Semitism, mainly in anti-democratic rhetoric, fuelled by nationalists, political or religious concerns and published in extremist publications or in some mainstream ones in a coded language of anti-Semitism.

In the aftermath of the Second World War and Holocaust, the post-war generation has been educated in tolerance. Society has denied legitimacy to anti-Semitic and racist positions, and the post-War generation has in general seemed genuinely anti-racist.

But with the growth of immigration and a significant increase in the number of asylum seekers following the Balkan War and wars in Africa, racism and xenophobia have returned.

### **Media and intolerance**

In the work promoting racial equality to promote social equality and combat racism and xenophobia the media are both friend and foe.

On the one hand, the media give readers, viewers and listeners an insight into and an understanding of the backgrounds, cultures and religions of people from ethnic minorities, and if the problems and successes experienced by immigrants and ethnic minorities are described in a balanced way such information helps greatly to ensure nuanced views on immigrants and to build bridges between minorities and the majority.

On the other hand, the media can also help to create fear and prejudice – and thus consciously or unconsciously create fertile ground for heavily negative views or even stir up racism and xenophobia. In many countries the media portray the picture of their own country as being a soft touch encouraging “thousands” or “floods” of refugees and asylum seekers who use up a lot of resources and tax payers money. Although journalists and programme makers generally have an anti-racist attitude, prejudices are reproduced in the media via a static conception of culture, the content of reporting, the roles distributed to ethnic minority spokespeople, and the culturalisation of minority issues. In such cases an already weak section of the population can then end up finding it even more difficult to become established in society. This is particularly a risk if the debate on foreigners is highly politicised and based on attitudes and feelings rather than facts and verifiable data. A comprehensive report by the EUMC on research on “Racism and Cultural Diversity in the mass media in the EU 1995-2000) shows the extent of the problem, and the following chapter and its examples are based on this report.

Media coverage and media policy often contribute to a racist vision of social reality by suppressing positive information about groups targeted by racists. Generally, the media in the news about ethnic, cultural, religious minorities and migrants in Europe focus on negativity, problems and crime. Very often there is an over-emphasis on ethnic and immigrant crime and especially in headlines links are established between the ethnicity, origin of groups or skin colour, on the one hand, and their deviant or criminal behaviour (and even character) on the other. This is the basis for generalisations that associate minority groups with crime. Crime reports related to migrants and asylum seekers also tend to be more dramatic, sensational and described in a more brutal and violent way than the general crime reports about domestic crime.

Crime is also typically associated with particular minority groups which naturally vary from region to region. For example, in Finnish media, hardly anything else has been covered for the largest groups of Russians and Estonians than crime “crime is more often related to visiting Russians and Estonians than to the family living next door”. In Italy and Greece, Albanian immigrants have been most frequently

associated with crime and presented in the media as an ungrateful, unreliable, disloyal, violent, criminal and lazy people. Very often the Albanians were associated with assaults, mafia practices and prostitution in documentaries and magazine articles. Also asylum seekers are negatively represented and framed as trying to defraud the social security systems, and in all European countries no other group is as negatively portrayed with the stereotype of crime as the the Romas, Sintis and Travellers.

In coverage on other issues related to ethnic, cultural and religious minorities the media often use a model according to which “we” are the victims and “they” are the problem. It appears especially in coverage of multicultural neighbourhoods and produces images of multicultural societies and polarised between minority and majority. The approach in various articles and TV-programmes dedicated to minority issues often is to break taboos on negative reporting, meaning that frequently ethnic and cultural difference (or socio-economic position) is mentioned as the cause for problems with migrant integration and life in multicultural neighbourhoods.

Labelling of minorities is often another way of negative generalising. In Italian media the most frequently used labels have referred to illegality (clandestini) or apparently neutral denominations with implicit negative connotations.

In Finnish media discriminatory labelling has been registered, where certain migrants and minorities come to be associated with one theme. The word “Somali” in Finnish media represents much more than nationality, it is used as a symbol for undesirable refugee. Therefore using this label in a headline about criminal offence may spur racial hostility. In Spanish media, offensive terms such as “moros” are no longer used, but the terms that have replaced this are also generalising (e.g. “coloured people”, “Africans”) This shows a slightly positive development, which seems to count also for other countries of more recent immigration such as Italy.

In Danish media, minority and migrant actors are often lumped together in homogeneous categories of “foreigners” and “immigrants”

In the British media, minorities are most often referred to by racial references (“black” and “white”). “Asian” is usually of more common usage than religious references, and there is very little use of homeland national identities.

In France, labelling of migrants has shown a gradual improvement in the sense that labels have become partly more positive over time. Previously, media discourse focussed only on the banlieues (a byword for social disadvantage, lawlessness, and ethnic criminality). Another label or category – that of “immigration” was usually emphasised in French media and official discourse since the 1980s. This referred in reality to second and third generation members of minorities, who hold French citizenship, and more in particular to post-colonial minorities. Recently, next to these negative labels also more positive ones are found in French media: that of sans papiers, which in many contexts has replaced the formerly used “clandestins”, indicating a partial softening of public opinion towards illegal immigration.

## **Reporting on Racism and the Extreme Right**

In countries with right wing extremists, media have reacted with a discourse between taboo and mitigation and dramatisation and over-reaction.

A distinction must here be made between reports about racism and xenophobia as a conviction within society, including racist violence, on the one hand, and reports about extreme right-wing parties, on the other. Electoral campaigns, in particular, provide opportunities for the extreme or radical right to air their views in articles, on radio and television.

The existing research shows that unintended and counterproductive effects of reporting on the extreme right depends on the type and quality of reporting. First, a public outcry can be counterproductive, when interpretations are incidental and not based on a continuous thematisation and problematisation. Also the representation of extreme forms of racism as an individual pathology may support forms of denial of racism.

It often seems that journalists do not actively seek to restrain the effects of reporting on racist violence since their first aim was factual reporting, and they do not see it as their task to put the struggle against racism on the political agenda.

Coverage of racist violence as part of the so-called neo-nazi or skinhead culture has received ample coverage in the media, and this has within the media led to discussions on racism and how to combat it. The positions are contrasting: concern about right-wing extremism and anti-Semitism is counter-balanced by a concern with immigration, indirectly identified as the cause of the racist excesses. In some cases racist crimes have not been taken seriously, and even the victims have been blamed. Denial of the racist nature of violent attacks against immigrants has occurred quite commonly. The incidents are for example presented as “accidents”

## **September 11**

Following the terrorist attacks in the United States on 11 September 2001, the EUMC immediately implemented a reporting system on potential anti-Islamic reactions in the 15 EU Member States, and in the “Summary Report on Islamophobia” the consequential impact in society that media images and representations can have on perceptions of Muslims was analysed.

In the period after September 11 certain media were identified as representing Muslims and Islam both negatively and stereotypically, sometimes as an almost necessary part of the reporting process., and the findings in the above mentioned report show that many of those that did change their attitudes or indeed participate in acts of aggression or violence towards Muslims, acted against visual identifiers that were essentially media-derived from the post-September 11 period.

It seems that behind the vast majority of attacks and infringements upon specific communities and individuals was the fact that they were identified as Muslims by visible identifiers such as headscarves, turbans or beard. The visual identifiers

provided a stimulant that offered an outlet for the venting of anger or some other denigratory sentiment.

The headscarf seems to have become the primary target for hatred, with Muslim women being routinely abused and attacked across those countries in Europe where Muslim women could be identified in this way. Media coverage is also seen to have some relevance to the targeting of Muslim women who were repeatedly highlighted in the media as being particularly oppressed in Afghanistan under Taleban rule. There may be some correlation, therefore, between the visual identifiers of Afghan women wearing the burqa with Muslim women in Europe wearing the headscarf.

Another significant victim in the rise of aggression were men who wore turbans. Whilst the turban would not necessarily be immediately identifiable as Islamic attire, in the media coverage of both September 11 and the war in Afghanistan, through the images of Osama bin Laden, the Taleban and everyday Afghans, the turban became an integral part of the semiotics of that period.

However, during the post-September 11 period some media sectors also were responsible and accountable, while others sought to remain balanced and objective. Where positive and balanced attitudes were identified in the various media, the reporting was built on dialogue with the Muslim community and a critical engagement not only with Islam, but also with topics relating more directly to September 11. In those media, Muslim voices were given a platform to be heard and a cross section of opinion was discussed. In Finland for example, national newspapers sought to provide a fair and informative debate. It included discussion by readers, both Muslim and non-Muslim, considering and including responses from other countries as well. In Austria various television broadcasts dealt intensively with the issues, but sought balance in the reporting. Programmes such as "Constructing Islam as an enemy?" included Islamic experts, whilst "Between fear and hope" included voices from the Austrian Islamic community. In these and many other examples of media coverage, there were neither trends of sensationalism nor stereotypification.

These trends were, however, a feature elsewhere. Sensationalism became a cornerstone of some reporting, whilst an inappropriate and disproportionate focus on extremist elements in Muslim communities became common.

### **Internet**

The Internet has become a forum for over 300 million potential users around the world. Among these users, racist, violent and extremist groups and groupings have been quick to learn how to take advantage of this medium through systematic and rational use: they utilise and exploit the Internet relatively effectively. According to the Simon Wiesenthal Centre, in 1995 there was just one website inciting racial hatred. In November 1997, the Centre counted 600, and 2100 in 1999. By 2002 this figure had risen to over 3 300.

Some 90% of these sites are made accessible by American service providers. European web publishers using American providers to host their sites are sure that they will not be identified, since the authorities in their own country cannot compel American providers to reveal the identity of the person responsible for publishing a racist site. "In this sense the United States are playing a role similar to that traditionally played by certain States as regards income tax (tax havens) or gambling", concludes Professor David Rosenthal. Wolfgang Neugebauer, Director of the

Austrian Resistance Documentation Centre, suggests that, because the United States have not experienced the horrors of Nazism and genocide on their territory, Americans will tolerate this form of expression, whereas countries such as Germany or Austria will not. Lastly, the American, Mark Potok - an expert at the Southern Poverty Law Center - adds that the Internet plays a "terribly important" role in bringing together European and American extremist groups, the latter having previously been somewhat isolated.

Some will say that there are so many sites (probably several million) that the figures quoted – whatever they may be, moreover – are insignificant; they will immediately add that one should not pay too much attention to, or be too concerned by, the existence of these extremist and racist sites. Others consider the Internet to be an attractive tool for racist propaganda, first of all because it guarantees a large audience for a modest outlay, secondly because it is difficult to track down all sites and, thirdly, because extremists can operate with impunity in certain countries.

It is probably for these three key reasons that movements or individuals spreading hatred have turned to the Net in recent years; this has, moreover, given them easy access to young people and other potential recruits. Also the Internet provides the link to enable mobilisation of extreme groups across borders, e.g. for demonstrations or football matches.

What was proscribed, carried out in secret, viewed as shameful and liable to prosecution in the past is nowadays perfectly readable and viewable on the Net. It could even be said that activists in movements which had been declining both in Europe and the United States have received a new lease of life thanks to the sites they have created. In some cases, one could even speak of a renaissance, so surprisingly large is the number of those logging on (the Stormfront website for example receives between 20 000 and 30 000 visits per day, and that of David Duke from 5000 to 10 000). The Net did not of course invent propaganda, nor can it be blamed for the formation and growth of these movements. Other parameters can explain what these movements are, the strategies deployed, the links they maintain among themselves and the impact they are likely to have. The Net is simply there, for you, for me. And the extremists know how to utilise it to disseminate their propaganda. Obviously, one does not automatically come across the pages of Stormfront or the Ku Klux Klan. One must want to find them, unless one happens upon sites which are too frequently and readily registered with search engines or search by curiosity.

Some maintain that the matter should not be overplayed, that a mere read-through may prove instructive and that, in any event, what already exists cannot be hidden. They recall that teachers and parents must play their part by telling youngsters how perverse and dangerous such texts are. Others feel a real sense of disquiet. They are worried by this ease of access, which might contaminate weak minds or potential recruits, without teachers and parents being able or knowing how to intervene.

### **Legal regime**

Whereas European legal traditions follow the line that racist propaganda may be prohibited by law as a permissible exception to the freedom of expression guaranteed in the Article 10 of the European Convention of Human Rights, legal traditions in the United States treat racist propaganda as tenable political view and therefore in

principle guaranteed by the freedom of expression guaranteed by the First Amendment of the US Constitution.

On an international level, the fight against racist propaganda started with the International Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (ICERD). Article 4 of the Convention reads:

“States Parties condemn all propaganda and all organisations which are based on ideas or theories of superiority of one race or group of persons of one colour or ethnic origin, or which attempt to justify or promote racial hatred and discrimination in any form, and undertake to adopt immediate and positive measures designed to eradicate all incitement to, or acts of, such discrimination.”

The Convention has been ratified by 160 states, and the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination has emphasised that Article 4 is central to the struggle against racial discrimination by means of printed documents, films or any other media. However, some countries have made a reservation to Article 4 of the Convention, and the United States upon ratification made the following reservation:

“That the Constitution and the laws of the United States contain extensive protections of individual freedom of speech, expression and association. Accordingly, the United States does not accept any obligation under this Convention, in particular under Article 4, to restrict those rights, through the adoption of legislation or any other measures, to the extent that they are protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States.”

In European jurisprudence racist propaganda is seen as a threat to the interests of national security, public safety and the protection of the rights of others and criminal provisions to fight racist propaganda are qualified as necessary in a democratic society.

The Council of Europe’s Committee of Ministers has issued two important Recommendations to Member States on hate speech Recommendation R (97) 20 and Recommendation R (97) 21 on the media and the promotion of a culture of tolerance.

The first provides governments with a series of principles to apply to hate speech, in particular through the media. The latter includes an appendix containing examples of professional practices conducive to the promotion of a culture of tolerance. These relate to training (initial and continuing), media enterprises, representative bodies of media professionals, codes of conduct, broadcasting and advertising.

To harmonise criminal legislation concerning racist propaganda the European Commission on 28 November 2001 submitted a proposal for a Council Framework Decision on combating racism and xenophobia. The purpose of this proposal is twofold: first, to ensure that racism and xenophobia are punishable in all Member States by effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal penalties, which can give rise to extradition or surrender, and second, to improve and encourage judicial cooperation by removing potential obstacles.

In Article 4 on “Offences concerning racism and xenophobia” the document proposes:



“Member States shall ensure that...public incitement to violence or hatred for a racist and xenophobic purpose or to any other racist or xenophobic behaviour which may cause substantial damage to individuals or groups concerned...is punishable as a criminal offence”.

The proposal is currently with the Council of Minister of Justice and Home Affairs in the European Union for consultation.

However, the necessary delicate balance between the right to be free from expressions of racial hatred and to be protected from incitement to racial discrimination and violence on the one hand, and the rights of freedom of expression on the other has not yet been found at the level of public international law.

### **Strategies**

In recent years, there has been a growing awareness in the media that they are supplying information and communicating in multicultural societies. Media professionals around the world contribute a great deal to the fight against racism and xenophobia. Coverage of the struggle against apartheid, the abuse of the rights of minorities in Africa and Europe, and the continuing focus on famine and the plight of refugees and dispossessed communities also show that journalists are increasingly alert to the dangers of discrimination.

Nevertheless, ignorance and lack of appreciation of different cultures, traditions and beliefs within the media still lead to stereotypes that reinforce racist attitudes. Editors, journalists and media staff need to understand better the potential impact of their words and images given the deeply rooted fears and apprehension of civil strife and social exclusion that exist within society.

The International Federation of Journalists during the United Nations World Conference against Racism in Durban in September 2001 called on the international community to support work being done by journalists and media staff at regional, national and international level who join together to reassert the core principles of truth telling, independence and ethical journalism. The IFJ has suggested establishing a vigorous new global information strategy, building on existing anti-racism initiatives, and supporting the professional objectives of media professionals. Such a strategy must promote:

#### **1. Editorial Independence and Effective Self-Regulation**

Journalists, media organisations and media staff should reaffirm editorial independence and the right of journalists to report freely. Such freedom of expression should be balanced against the protection of the rights of others. Material that incites hatred is unacceptable. Journalists' groups should be encouraged to prepare and distribute their own guidelines and style manuals for journalists on discrimination and racism issues.

#### **2. Diversity Within Media**

Journalists' unions and media organisations should adopt recruitment policies to encourage journalists from ethnic or minority communities to enter journalism. Newsrooms should reflect the ethnic composition of society.

### 3. Training for Tolerance

Journalism training and education that addresses issues of discrimination and intolerance and which encourages students of different ethnic backgrounds to enter journalism should be established and supported.

### 4. Building Industry, Co-operation and Solidarity

Dialogue within journalism towards better professional understanding of the role of the media in confronting racism should be encouraged and the creation of a global network of media players – journalists, editors and media employers – that are committed to professional excellence and positive actions to highlight the impact of racism should be supported.

### 5. Raising Awareness Among Journalists

Follow-up actions that support media projects to promote inclusive journalism and which highlights the positive role journalists can play in creating a culture of tolerance should be promoted. In particular, the UN Human Rights Commission, working with UNESCO and other relevant agencies, should support initiatives, from within journalism, to:

- monitor and report on media performance in the area of intolerance and bring discussion of these issues into the mainstream of journalism;
- establish a world-wide media campaign on Journalism for Tolerance to give journalists advice on how to counter hate speech and to provide information on national strategies for unions and media organisations dealing with racism issues;
- support the creation of structures for dialogue between media organisations, journalists' unions and associations and other groups concerned with the elimination of racism to strengthen the quality of media coverage.

### **Good practices**

Ethnic minorities will form an increasingly important sector of the population over the next few decades, and the media has a special role to play in educating the public by highlighting the growing diversity in their societies and audiences. A multi-cultural media policy both in reporting and employment can have a profound effect on the perceptions and attitudes of the public. The new readership or audience must be able to recognize themselves in the mainstream media output of the countries where they live. If not, they will look to other media, international newspapers and satellite, cable or internet stations from their countries of origin or set up by their peers. Media organisations are increasingly becoming more aware of the potential offered by the various groups in society, and many forms of positive action have been initiated within many media organisations both at national and international level.

In Belgium, the Flemish public broadcaster VRT has drawn up an action plan focussing on two main projects: increasing employment of ethnic minority staff and

establishing a balanced representation of ethnic minorities. The first goal should be achieved by screening the VRT's recruitment procedures to detect possible discriminatory thresholds and by advertising vacancies via minorities interest groups or networks. The public broadcaster hopes to obtain the second goal – of representation – by creating a database of professionals and experts from minority groups as a ready reference tool for journalists and programme makers. This should increase the visibility of ethnic minorities in VRT programmes.

In Sweden, the Swedish Broadcast company and the newspaper Dagens Nyheter have recruited unemployed persons with immigrant and/or journalist backgrounds, to give them an opportunity to work and further their education. At Göteborgs-Posten a consultancy group has been made up of representatives from the largest minority groups, who are invited to discuss the contents of the paper with the editors once a month. Within the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation, Sveriges Radio (SR) has adopted an active policy for increasing cultural diversity in programming and at work as well as antidiscrimination measures. The informational project Quick Response started in 1998 and monitors the news media and responds – by means of consulting a number of experts – to erroneous or biased media reports in questions involving immigration, integration, racism and xenophobia. The organisation also provides journalists, students and individuals with facts and background information on questions regarding multiculturalism in Sweden.

In Italy the Florence-based organisation COSPE (Cooperazione allo sviluppo dei paesi emergenti, Development Cooperation for Developing Countries) has launched and continues to develop numerous initiatives to promote cultural diversity in the media. In 2000 a course on social communication trained migrants in the production of multilingual media. Participants produced the first two issues of a multilingual newspaper, and contributed to the production of the radio programme Mondo Babel (World of Babylon)

In Britain, the regulatory framework has given greater priority to curbing racially offensive items in recent years. Most fields of media and public relations now have established codes of practice. The broadcasting media have taken internal initiatives to address improving the presentation of minorities. For example, the Channel 4 includes at least three hours multicultural programming a week and BBC has since 1989 been setting targets for the proportion of staff that should come from ethnic minorities for each directorate. By 2000 BBC met its target of 8 % of staff from ethnic minority background, and a new target has been outlined to increasing minority staff to 10 % by 2003 and doubling the amount of ethnic minority managers from two to four per cent.

In Finland the media have made some attempts to balance the reporting of minority issues. The National Broadcasting Company, YLE, runs a weekly television programme Bazaari that deals with ethnic issues, and uses journalists with foreign backgrounds. The main problem with it, however, is that it is aired at a bad time in the early afternoon. The second largest daily paper, Aamulehti, publishes an immigrant page and people with a foreign background appear as writers.

## **International initiatives to promote good practice**

In recent years, several important initiatives have been developed at international level to develop instruments for increasing cultural diversity in the media.

The International Federation of Journalists (IFJ) and its initiative for the networking organisation International Media Working Group Against Racism and Xenophobia (IMRAX) have launched numerous projects to promote tolerance in the media, among others the publication of a resource manual for “Reporting Diversity”.

The European network Online/More Colour in the Media, coordinated by the Dutch non-government organisation MiraMedia has published a handbook for promoting diversity in the broadcast media, entitled “Tuning in to Diversity” and a handbook for trainers working for more “colour” in the media. Online/More Colour in the Media has launched a new project to establish a European Day of Monitoring to monitor the media output on its representation of cultural diversity.

The organisation Public Broadcasting for a Multicultural Europe (PBME) has drawn up recommendations for good practice, in consultation with members of the European Broadcasting Union Television Programming Committee.

Several NGOs and media organisations have launched awards to promote tolerance in the media. The International Federation of Journalists have launched the “IFJ Prize”, Prix Europa Iris, which is awarded to TV and radio programmes that contribute towards understanding and tolerance, the Race in the Media Awards organised by the Commission for Racial Equality United Kingdom and since 2000 the CivisEurope television prize has been honouring programmes, which take a stand against racism and xenophobia. CivisEurope is organised by the ARD, First German Television Channel, represented by Westdeutscher Rundfunk, together with the Commissioner of the Federal Government for Foreigners’ Affairs, the Freudenberg Foundation and the EUMC.

## **Conclusions**

The media, and especially the news media, have an unequivocal position in society when it comes to establishing and disseminating common cultural references. Media can help people get to know each other, understand each other – and learn from another, and the media has a special role to play in educating the public by highlighting the growing diversity in their societies and audiences. The new audiences must be able to recognize themselves in the mainstream media output of the countries where they live.

In a world dominated by international collaboration and increasing globalisation it is necessary to get away from the “them” and “us” mindset and learn to accept different and diversity. To bring about such a change the media must reflect cultural diversity and offer representation and a voice to all social groups and subcultures. At the same time they must avoid discriminatory practices and undertake to impart information in ways which safeguard fairness and equality.

*Sources: “Racism and cultural diversity in the mass media” published by the European Monitoring Centre, 2002.*  
*“European Conference against Racism” published by the Council of Europe, 2000.*  
*“Challenging the media – for equality and diversity against racism”, EUMC 1999*